

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAYRIN ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNKNOWN,

Defendant.

Case No. [19-cv-04216-SI](#)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On August 15, 2019, mail that had been sent from the court to plaintiff at the address he provided to the court was returned undelivered, bearing handwritten notations “RTS” (which is a common acronym for “return to sender”) and “refused.” Docket No. 5. Another piece of mail sent to plaintiff was returned undelivered on September 24, 2019, with a handwritten notation “refused – return to sender.” Docket No. 6. Plaintiff has not provided any address other than the address to which the undeliverable mail was sent. More than sixty days have passed since the mail was first returned to the court undelivered. Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a) which requires a party proceeding *pro se* to “promptly file with the court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address” when his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the court to dismiss a complaint without prejudice when mail directed to a *pro se* party is returned as not deliverable and the *pro se* party fails to send written notice of his current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail. This action is DISMISSED without prejudice because plaintiff failed to keep the court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 2, 2019



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge